

Interactive comment on “Rain research with disdrometers: a bibliometric review” by M. Fernandez-Raga et al.

O. Pujol

olivier.pujol@loa.univ-lille1.fr

Received and published: 17 November 2011

The paper of Fernandez-Raga (FR) et al. proposes a complete bibliography about rain measurements by disdrometers. A statistical, historical and geographical bibliographic study is performed, which is welcome. This study is based on the analyze of more than 300 peer-reviewed articles. Various criteria are considered: countries, journal (60), publication dates (since 1963), number of articles, concepts tackled (meteorology, modelling, hydrology), lines of investigation followed in each article.

This work is very original and of great interest. One has to underline the exhaustivity of the manuscript proposed by FR et al.

C2087

I would like to indicate that papers of this kind are rather rare in the literature. Indeed, scientists most often focus on specific points and do not take time to think about their domain of investigation and to adopt a synthetic point of view. Most of the time, scientists are mainly concerned by specific points, for example the physics of disdrometer-measurements (i.e improvements of the measure, dropsize distribution interpretation, correlations with radar data, ...). So, one can find many specific papers about "disdrometry", and literature is quite poor in papers dealing with bibliographic studies about a given topic. Consequently, the text proposed by FR. et al is original. It is an exhaustive and synthetic review about rain disdrometer-measurements and the corresponding bibliography. It provides very interesting information. The work presented by FR et al. is of quality, and this paper will certainly be very useful and fruitful for researches and PhD students.

In addition, the manuscript is clearly written and English is very good.

I strongly recommend the publication of the Fernandez-Raga's work in AMT.

Minor comments:

- 1) Table 1: Please indicate in the legend of the table the signification of K L R N P Q F (first row). And I suppose "A...AF" are journal identifiers. Please clarify.
- 2) Fig. 2: Is it necessary to give all the years in the axis of abscisae ? Maybe considering the years 1980 - 1985 - 1990 etc. would be sufficient.
- 3) Fig. 3: The final number "0.0055169" is not easy to read due to the black solid curve.
- 4) Fig. 5: Please separate "New Zealand 1974" and the other 4 from the bars.
- 5) Fig. 7: Same comment as Fig. 2. It is not necessary to give all the years in the graph.
- 6) Fig. 8: Too small. Please write bigger.